

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Arthur Daniel Mayo,  
Petitioner  
v.  
Jo Gentry, et al.,  
Respondents

2:16-cv-00599-JAD-GWF  
**Order**  
[ECF No. 39]

10 In this habeas corpus action, respondents were granted a 30-day extension of time to file  
11 an answer, making December 1, 2017, their new deadline.<sup>1</sup> On December 1, 2017, another time-  
12 extension motion was filed, this time requesting four additional days because counsel for the  
13 respondents had obligations in other cases that inhibited her from answering sooner.<sup>2</sup> Counsel  
14 answered four days later.

I find that the motion for an extension of time was made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the requested time extension. I will therefore grant the motion for an extension of time and treat the answer as timely filed.

18        Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondents' motion for enlargement of  
19 time [ECF No. 39] is GRANTED, and the answer will be treated as timely filed. **Mayo's reply**  
20 **is due February 5, 2018.**

DATED: December 7, 2017.

  
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 38.

$\stackrel{2}{\sim} Id.$